

DRAWING AMENDMENTS:

Please add Figure 11, attached to this Amendment by way of a separate sheet, to the formal drawings of the disclosure of this Application.

REMARKS

The Examiner's Action mailed on September 11, 2008, has been received and its contents carefully considered.

Claims 1 and 3-8 are pending in this Application. Claim 1 is amended. Claim 2 is canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited in that claim. Claim 1 is the independent claim. For at least the following reasons, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance.

The Office Action states that claims 5 and 6 recite allowable subject matter. The Applicants appreciate this indication of allowability.

The Office Action asserts that no statement of relevance accompanies Japanese references 57-144383 and 61-094676, and therefore does not consider these references. However, this assertion is incorrect. As discussed in MPEP §609.04(a)(III), where the information listed is not in the English language, but was cited in a search report or other action by a foreign patent office in a counterpart foreign application, the requirement for a concise explanation of relevance can be satisfied by submitting an English-language version of the search report or action which indicates the degree of relevance found by the foreign office. This may be an explanation of which portion of the reference is particularly relevant, to which claims it applies, or merely an "X", "Y", or "A" indication on a search report. An English-language International Search Report satisfying the above requirements was received in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on January 27, 2006. As such, the references are accompanied by a statement of relevance and must be

considered by the Examiner. Consideration of the above noted references is therefore respectfully requested.

The Office Action objects to the Drawings of this Application for not showing every feature recited in the pending claims. Fig. 11 is added and the Specification is amended to obviate this objection. Support for this subject matter may be found on page 2, lines 13-22, page 3, line 1, and page 4, lines 8-22. Withdrawal of the objection to the Drawings is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments to the Drawings and the Specification.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3, 4, 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over KR-2002-004-4446 to *Seok* in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,168,840 to *Graham*; and rejects claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Seok*, in view of *Graham* and U.S. Patent No. 5,136,451 to *Valdemarsson et al.* (hereinafter "*Valdemarsson*"). The rejections respectfully are traversed.

The Office Action asserts that the above references, in combination, teach the features positively recited in the pending claims. The applicants respectfully disagree.

Claim 1 recites a plurality of current limiter circuits comprising the current limiter element, the current limiter circuits connected in parallel and configured to operate at different voltages to limit the current flowing through the solenoid to the predetermined current. This feature is illustrated and described by way of example, in Fig. 3, and on page 11, lines 6-11, in which a plurality of current limiter circuits 21, 22, and 23 are connected in parallel across a voltage source to form

the current limiting element. In contrast, *Valdemarsson* teaches a single current limiting element. Therefore, *Valdemarsson* does not teach a plurality of current limiter circuits connected in parallel.

The Office Action further asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to arrange the single current limiter of *Valdemarsson* in parallel with other current limiters as disclosed by the reference, to arrive at the subject matter of the pending claims. However, this assertion is incorrect. *Valdemarsson* teaches that a single current limiter is used to control and direct arcing current which would otherwise damage a circuit, as discussed in col. 1, lines 6-24. Further the reference teaches that the current limiter may be connected in series with other current limiters to dissipate arcs with energy greater than can be dissipated by a single limiter, as discussed in col. 2, lines 66-68, and further shown in Fig. 2. As discussed in col. 3, lines 1-2, the current limiter units are connected in parallel with resistors to help in absorbing the arc energy, and are not connected in parallel with other current limiters. *Valdemarsson* teaches only that current limiters may be connected in series with each other to dissipate greater energies.

Therefore, the *Valdemarsson* reference cannot reasonably be considered to teach, or to have suggested, a plurality of current limiter circuits connected in parallel, as recited in amended claim 1.

Further, *Seok* and *Graham* fail to overcome the deficiencies above.

In view of the above, no permissible combination of the applied references can reasonably be considered to teach, or to have suggested, the combination of

features recited in pending independent claim 1. Claims 3-8 are also allowable, at least for their dependence on an allowable independent claim 1 as discussed above, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recite.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the pending rejections of the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §103 are respectfully requested.

It is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Such action, and the passing of this case to issue are requested.

Should the Examiner feel that a conference would help to expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to contact the undersigned counsel to arrange for such an interview.

Should any fee be required, the Director is hereby authorized to charge the fee to our Deposit Account No. 18-0002, and is requested to advise us accordingly.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven M. Rabin – Reg. No. 29,102
RABIN & BERDO, PC – Cust. No. 23995
Telephone: 202-371-8976
Fax: 202-408-0924

December 11, 2008
Date

SMR/ARK/klc
Enclosures:

Replacement drawing sheet (Fig. 11)